

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/761,401	OLOFSSON, OLA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shelley Self	3725	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Shelley Self. (3) Thomas Pavelko.
 (2) Eric Robbins. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 July 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Serino et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant stated that there is a difference in surface finish between a broached surface and a milled surface. Applicant believes this surface finish to be patentable and believes the differences to only result from a broaching tool. Examiner stated the claim(s) as written are silent to any surface finish of the board(s) or any differences between the milled surface and broached surfaces. Applicant suggested submitting an affidavit stating the structural and surface differences between milled and broached surfaces. Applicant additionally suggested amending the claim to state a broached burr-free surface. Examiner notes that such amendment would required further/additional search and may not be entered as an after-final amendment. Applicant to consider filing an RCE.